

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 287

UD 023 770

AUTHOR Chan, Sucheng
TITLE Asian American-Pacific American Relations: The Asian American Perspective.
INSTITUTION Association for Asian/Pacific American Studies, Seattle, WA.
SPONS AGENCY Office for Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs (ED), Washington, DC. Office of Asian/Pacific American Concerns.
PUB DATE 17 Aug 82
NOTE 52p.; For related documents, see UD 023 771-772.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; Bilingual Education; Community Attitudes; Community Characteristics; *Cultural Differences; Elementary Secondary Education; Health; *Immigrants; *Labeling (of Persons); *Pacific Americans; Political Influences; Population Distribution; Social Integration; Stereotypes; United States History

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the migration and settlement history of Asians into the United States and the interaction of the major Asian immigrants with each other and with American society. An important thesis is that, because the differences between Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are much greater than the similarities between them, they should no longer be treated as a single social entity. The term "Asian" is used to refer to persons originating in China, Japan, Korea, India, the Philippines, and Vietnam. "Pacific Islanders" represents Chamorros (from Guam), Samoans (both East and West), Native Hawaiians, and Tongans. The paper is divided into five major parts: (1) "Asian Immigration History, 1849-Present"; (2) "Settlement Patterns and Labor History"; (3) "Community Structure, Inter-ethnic Relations and Cultural Development"; (4) "Contemporary Issues" (including education, employment, health and mental health, community development, cultural integrity, and civic participation); and, finally, (5) "Asian Americans' Perceptions of and Attitudes towards Pacific Islander".
(KH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED248287

**ASIAN AMERICAN - PACIFIC AMERICAN RELATIONS:
THE ASIAN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE**

By
Sucheng Chan
University of California
Berkeley, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.



**ASSOCIATION FOR
ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN STUDIES**

UD003770

AUG 15 1984

ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC AMERICAN RELATIONS: THREE STUDIES

By

ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN STUDIES



Prepared for

Office of Asian/Pacific American Concerns Staff

U.S. Department of Education

501 Reporters Building

400 Maryland Avenue S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20202

Prepared by

Association for Asian/Pacific American Studies

Room B-503 Padelford Hall

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98195

Contact Person:

Douglas W. Lee, Ph.D.

Project Director

August 17, 1982

Introduction.

The resurgence of ethnicity as a salient feature of American political and social life in the last two decades has made it imperative for policy-makers, deliverers of social services, members of the public, as well as scholars to become more precise in their understanding of ethnicity, and especially in their use of terms to denote particular ethnic groups. A case in point is the label "Asian Pacific Americans." It is a term which is shot through with ambiguity. What groups should be included under the label's rubric? Do the diverse groups to be so included in fact have anything in common in terms of their culture, history and contemporary conditions?

The Asian Pacific American population residing in the United States today is an extremely heterogeneous one. Although we hail from the same continent and an adjoining ocean, and most of us bear some physical resemblance to each other, in reality, there is a rich diversity of languages, cultures and histories found among us. While the innocent outsider may think that our "cultural heritage" and racial origins are what make it possible to lump us together, in the view of this writer, it is not our cultural heritage brought over from Asia and the Pacific Basin which forms the basis of our commonality; rather, it is the similarity of our American experience which provides justification for treating us as a single group, if we can be treated as such at all. It is United States public policy and public reactions to our presence which have forged the true common bonds among us. In short, we cannot understand the full implication of the term "Asian Pacific Americans"

if we do not recognize its political, as well as demographic, dimension.

The term "Asian Americans" came into popular usage in the mid-1960's when youthful activists in the civil rights and the anti-war movements wanted to find a short-hand way to proclaim the bonds of unity among Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans and a smaller number of Filipino Americans and Korean Americans. Calling ourselves "Asian Americans" was a way of saying it didn't matter what the national origin of each group was; what mattered was our common history of oppression in America. Like the terms "Chicanos" and "Blacks," the term "Asian Americans" was a declaration that we were proud of our minority status. It was a rallying cry for action. Being Asian Americans, therefore, carried with it simultaneously a sense of pride in discovering one's roots, and a sense of belonging to a movement whose members perceived themselves to be active agents of social change in America.

There was a paradox in the feelings Asian Americans had about our "roots." On the one hand, while we were proud to declare our Asian identity, on the other hand, we were also eager to repudiate certain aspects of our specific heritage, such as the subordinate status accorded women, youth and poor people in some traditional Asian cultures. Some activists also rejected the narrow parochialism which part of our cultural heritage dictated. For example, at that time, many older persons of Chinese, Korean and Filipino ancestry in America still had strong animosity towards persons of Japanese ancestry, because of Japan's actions in China, Korea and the Philippines during World War II. Their children, however, chose to proclaim that they considered what had happened in Asia over two decades ago to be of less political importance than what had happened to our ancestors in America, or what was happening to Vietnamese — an Asian people — as a result of

United States presence there. The activists considered the American war in Vietnam to be a racist and imperialist war against their Asian brothers and sisters. Such feelings of pan-Asian solidarity probably was at its height in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Those were the halcyon days before sectarianism and factionalism split many of the Asian American movement groups asunder.

Some years later, the adjective "Pacific" got grafted onto the term "Asian Americans" to form the compound label "Asian Pacific Americans." This, too, was a political act. Pacific Islanders were still relatively small in number, as were Asian Americans. It was thought that lumping the two groups together would increase our political strength. Government officials and funding agencies seemed to have welcomed such a compound label, for it minimized redtape, was convenient, and seemed logical. After all, doesn't the Asian continent border on the Pacific Ocean?

In the last few years, however, as the numbers of both umbrella groups have increased, we became less concerned with our lack of visibility vis-a-vis other minorities and the white majority — at least in a state such as California. Consequently, more fundamental questions have come to the fore: Should the two umbrella groups really be aggregated when the heterogeneity within each side of the equation is already so great? Has there been parity between the two groups in terms of funding and political power? Isn't lumping all of us together a way to hasten the disintegration of our distinct communities and the cultural uniqueness which lies at the foundation of each community's social, economic and political integrity? These questions, and others to be raised, will have to be examined in an honest and open way. However, we would be naive indeed if we do not recognize from the beginning that the issues are political ones. Therefore, they cannot be

resolved by a simplistic examination of the similarities and differences in our cultures and our histories. At stake is a question of relative power and access to resources. By aggregating the many different groups, to what extent will each component group be able to plan its own strategy for survival and growth?

The present paper will examine the migration and settlement history of Asians into the United States, and the interaction of the major Asian immigrant groups with each other and with American society at large. Such a survey is intended to provide background information for a public discussion of the wisdom of continuing to treat Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans as a single social entity.

Asian Immigration History, 1849-Present: An Overview.

Asia is an immense continent. Diverse ethnic groups possessing distinct cultures and national histories live contiguously to each other across a land mass which stretches from the Mediterranean Sea in the west to the Pacific Ocean in the east, and from the tundra of Siberia in the north to the rain forests of Southeast Asia in the south. Of the myriad peoples who live on the Asian continent, however, only six groups have emigrated in significant numbers to the western hemisphere. They are the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos,¹ Asian Indians,² and Vietnamese. Smaller immigrant groups come from Burma, Thailand, Laos, Kampuchea,³ Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia. These latter groups have come in significant numbers only in the last decade. There are also immigrants from Iran and other Middle Eastern countries who have settled in the United States. However, although technically speaking these persons are also Asians, in common usage Iranians and other Middle Easterners now residing in the United States are not referred to as "Asian Americans." The four major groups of Pacific Islanders

who are here today are Chamorros from Guam, Samoans from both American Samoa (a territory of the United States) and Western Samoa (an independent nation), native Hawaiians and Tongans. Strictly speaking, Chamorros, Samoans from American Samoa, and native Hawaiians are not immigrants; rather, they are migrants from U.S. territories in the case of Chamorros and Samoans, and migrants from our fiftieth state in the case of native Hawaiians.

With the exception of the Vietnamese, the other five major Asian immigrant groups have come in three waves. The first wave began with Chinese immigration in 1849 and continued until the termination of Filipino mass immigration in 1934. Between 1934 and 1965, immigration restriction was in effect for all Asians; the only Asians who entered the United States for permanent settlement came in either under special legislation (e.g., War Brides' Act, and various Refugee Acts) or as illegal entrants. The immigrants who came during this thirty-year period are sometimes known as "second wave" immigrants. Asian mass immigration resumed when the "national origins" system of immigration was rescinded by the Act of October 3, 1965 (79 Stat. 911) which was passed by the U. S. Congress, partly in the spirit of bringing about the Great Society envisioned by Lyndon B. Johnson, and partly to meet the needs of the U. S. economy for technical manpower in the post-Sputnik era. The contemporary Asian immigrants are sometimes called "third wave" Asian immigrants.

In no period were Asian immigrants a representative cross-section of the populations in their countries of origin. The reason is that mass migration across the Pacific Ocean have occurred in response to specific historical socio-economic conditions on both sides of the Pacific, so those who came were in a sense self-selected. The bulk of the first wave immigrants were laborers, for it was laborers who were needed to work in the developing

enterprises of the American west. Smaller numbers of merchants, farmers and students also came. Many second wave immigrants were women who married U. S. servicemen of both Asian and non-Asian ancestry. There were also political refugees from China and Korea. Among Filipinos, many second wave immigrants were individuals who had served in the U. S. armed forces during World War II. Contemporary third wave immigrants are more motley in their social origins. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, a large percentage of the immigrants had professional and technical training prior to immigration. Members of nuclear families who had been separated sometimes for decades have also entered in increasing numbers to join their loved ones. More recently, individuals with capital to invest have also received preference for entry.

During each period of immigration, a different set of "push" and "pull" factors have been at work to draw Asians to the western hemisphere. Most of the first wave immigrants came as a result of economic forces affecting the world economy during the second half of the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth century. Push and pull factors were equally strong. Second wave immigrants came mainly because of push factors, which were political in nature. War and revolution in certain Asian countries created an outflow of refugees, some of whom were allowed to settle in the United States. War also permitted Asian-ancestry veterans to be "rewarded" for their service by a grant of citizenship or permanent resident status. Although pull factors were no doubt present, these were essentially non-operative, for restrictions on Asian immigration were in effect. Third wave immigrants again are motivated primarily by economic incentives. However, other factors, such as the desire for family reunification, or the desire to leave unstable political situations in their countries of origin, are

also at work. On balance, pull factors are probably somewhat stronger than push factors in contemporary immigration.

Settlement Patterns and Labor History.

Since the majority of the first wave Asian immigrants came to the western hemisphere in search of work, the availability of work determined to a large extent the settlement patterns of Asian Americans. During the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth, four economic developments in Hawaii and the Pacific coast states served as the magnet which drew Asian immigrants or migrant workers across the Pacific. These were the Gold Rush in California, the growth of the sugar industry in Hawaii, the development of intensive agriculture in California and in the Hood River Valley of Oregon and the Yakima Valley of Washington, and the building and maintenance of an intricate infrastructure of railroads throughout the western states. All of these developments required vast amounts of labor. Moreover, the labor had to be relatively cheap, and available when desired. Prior to the completion of the transcontinental railroad and for some years afterwards, it was both difficult and expensive for immigrants and laborers from the American east coast and the trans-Mississippi west to come to the Pacific coast. In comparison, labor could be secured more easily and at a lower transportation cost from across the Pacific. This was especially true for the Hawaiian Islands.⁴ China's huge population was looked upon as a great reservoir of labor which could be tapped.

At the same time, developments in China made it necessary for many peasants and poor laborers to emigrate, or to suffer starvation and death. A series of wars and natural disasters ravaged the Chinese countryside in the 1840 to 1880 period.⁵ In addition, western economic incursion affected certain aspects of the peasant economy, especially in the immediate hinterland surrounding treaty port cities, so that it became increasingly

difficult for the Chinese peasants to find means to supplement their income from the land. Emigration became not only attractive but imperative for survival. Actually, during this period, an imperial edict forbidding emigration was in effect, but Chinese living in the southeastern provinces of Kwangtung and Fukien found it easy enough to bypass this law, with the help of western labor recruiters and steamship agents.⁶ The Chinese emigrants who came to Hawaii and California were only a small fraction of the total stream of emigrants, the bulk of whom went to the lands of Southeast Asia which were then being colonized and developed economically by European colonial powers, and to Latin America where labor power was also needed on sugar plantations, coffee plantations, rubber plantations, guano beds and railroads.⁷

Although labor importation was the main mechanism which structured Chinese migration and the migration of later Asian groups, it should be noted that during the first fifteen years of Chinese immigration into California, those who came were mainly aspiring gold miners. The immigrants did not come as recruited laborers. They were drawn here by the glitter of gold, just as individuals from all parts of the world were. Only after gold mining began to wane did Chinese immigrants enter the labor market as wage earners. It should also be noted that until 1866, when years of cumulative drought killed off hundreds of thousands of cattle in California, the California agricultural economy was essentially a pastoral one.⁸ Only after the demise of cattle raising did bonanza wheat farms develop.⁹ Neither cattle raising nor wheat growing was particularly labor intensive. Thus, although we have contemporaneous accounts which tell of Chinese laborers working during the wheat harvests in California, the early introduction of large-scale farming equipment in California (which predated the introduction of similar machinery for general usage in the prairie states¹⁰) meant that the availability of a cheap labor supply was not mandatory for the state's

agriculture during the first two decades of Chinese immigration. It cannot be argued, therefore, that Chinese were first brought to California to serve as farm laborers. Rather, it was the building of the transcontinental railroad which provided the impetus for labor recruiters to bring large gangs of Chinese laborers to America under structured conditions.¹¹ In terms of timing, when the first transcontinental railroad was completed, labor intensive agriculture was just beginning to be developed in California. Sacramento County led the state in this transformation. Since the western terminus of the transcontinental railroad lay in Sacramento City, discharged railroad laborers naturally found their way back to Sacramento, where they formed a welcome labor supply for the county's horticulturalists. Soon, Chinese farmworkers and tenant farmers spread northwards to cultivate the bottomlands along the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, eastwards into the fruit growing belt which stretches from the Newcastle district to the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in Placer County, westwards into the Santa Clara Valley where Chinese berry growers had already established a firm foothold by the late 1860's in truck gardening and berry growing, and southwards to plant and work in the new vineyards of Fresno County in the late 1880's and 1890's.

First wave Chinese immigrants worked in almost all the pioneering economic ventures in the Pacific coast states. They were therefore scattered in localities all over the Pacific coast. While San Francisco has served as the metropolitan center of "Chinese America" from the beginning of Chinese immigration to the present day, at no time did the city and county of San Francisco contain more than a small fraction of the total Chinese immigrant population in the United States. By the 1880's, perhaps as a result of stronger anti-Chinese sentiment in the western states, an increasing

number of Chinese immigrants moved to the east coast, and a small number even settled in the Mississippi Delta and in the area around Chicago.

Chinese participation in the building of the first (and subsequent) transcontinental railroads was a historical irony, for it was the completion of the railroads which enabled large numbers of Euro-American settlers to come to the Pacific coast with ease. As white labor became available, Chinese labor was less urgently needed. Moreover, as white labor gained in numerical strength, it could also organize to defend its own interests. Anti-Chinese sentiment erupted into mob violence and became an institutionalized feature of the American social fabric.¹² In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Law which prohibited the further entry of Chinese laborers. It was the first instance in American history when a specific group of people was excluded on the basis of racial origin. In the post-1882 period, only a small number of Chinese merchants, students, travellers, diplomats and children of a handful of Chinese who had American citizenship could enter the United States.

Japanese immigrants began to enter in the mid-1880's. Up to this point, the Japanese government also disapproved of emigration. However, the persistent recruitment efforts of the Hawaiian sugar industry, coupled with difficulties experienced by Japanese peasants in certain regions as a result of economic changes which occurred after the Meiji Restoration, eventually opened the way for Japanese emigration to the western hemisphere.¹³ Japanese immigration into Hawaii and the continental United States increased until 1907, when anti-Japanese sentiment had burgeoned to such an extent that the further immigration of Japanese laborers was also curbed. A so-called Gentlemen's Agreement made between the Japanese government and the United States government led the Japanese government to stop the

further issuance of passports to laborers. For the next dozen years thereafter, those Japanese immigrants who chose to remain in America brought several thousand "picture brides" over to create families in America.¹⁴ Japanese immigration was terminated altogether with the passage of the 1924 Immigration and Naturalization Act. This act did not name any group explicitly. However, since it forbade the immigration of persons "ineligible to citizenship" through naturalization, its main target was the Japanese who comprised the only significant group of immigrants during this period who were ineligible to be naturalized. According to the U. S. Constitution, originally only "free white persons" were given the right of naturalization. After the Civil War, persons of African ancestry were also granted this right. However, Asian immigrants were considered to be neither white nor black, and a series of court decisions in cases brought by Asian immigrant plaintiffs all the way up to the U. S. Supreme Court repeatedly affirmed that Asian-ancestry persons were considered to be ineligible.

Japanese immigrant communities were more concentrated on the west coast than were Chinese immigrant communities. Two reasons account for this greater geographic concentration. First, by the time Japanese immigrants began to enter, the western economy had begun to industrialize, and with the maturation of the American labor movement, entry into various employment sectors became more restricted. Asian immigrants found it increasingly more difficult to get into the skilled trades or into industrial blue collar jobs. Second, agriculture in the Pacific coast states was booming and consumed an extraordinary amount of farm labor. Agriculture also provided one of the few economic sectors with some built-in social mobility for immigrants who did not speak English well. Since many of the Japanese immigrants came from agricultural backgrounds, it was natural that a

sympiotic relationship developed between California agriculture and Japanese immigrants. For this reason, Japanese immigrants were less spread out than their Chinese predecessors had been, both geographically and occupationally. Within California itself, Japanese American communities developed in dozens of towns in the Central Valley, with the greatest settlement concentration in the stretch between Sacramento City and Fresno City. The land boom in Los Angeles also served as a magnet for Japanese immigrant settlement. Los Angeles became the metropolitan center of "Japanese America."¹⁵

In contrast to Chinese and Japanese immigration, Korean immigration was small in scale and short-lived in time. Between 1902 and 1905, approximately seven thousand Korean immigrants were brought to work on the sugar plantations of Hawaii. Of this initial batch, over one thousand returned to Korea, and some two thousand trans-migrated to California. Korean emigration was halted in 1905 by the Japanese government when she established a protectorate over Korea. However, after the Japanese government formally annexed Korea in 1910, the Japanese government decided to permit Korean women who wanted to marry Korean immigrants in America to receive exit visas. Between 1910 and 1924, some one thousand Korean picture brides came to Hawaii and California. In the continental United States, the only Korean settlements of any numerical significance were in the towns of Reedley and Dinuba in the viticulture districts of the San Joaquin Valley. Aside from the picture brides, the only other Koreans to enter the United States before the post-World War II period were a small number of students and anti-Japanese political activists in exile. The latter group of persons were scattered more widely in the United States than those engaged in agriculture.¹⁶

Between 1904 and 1917, several thousand Asian Indian immigrants also

came to the Pacific coast states. The majority of the early immigrants were Sikhs from the Punjab region of India. Many of these immigrants came by way of British Columbia, for the British had taken Sikh soldiers to various parts of the British Empire during Queen Victoria's diamond jubilee, and a number of Sikhs had apparently remained in British Columbia and word was relayed back of the economic opportunities to be found there. The lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest, railroad maintenance throughout the western states, and California agriculture provided the main employment opportunities for Asian Indian immigrants. Unlike other Asian immigrant groups, few Asian Indian immigrants went to settle in Hawaii. No one has done research to determine the reasons for this historical anomaly. Perhaps the use of Asian Indians — who became British subjects after India was colonized by Great Britain — was obviated by the rivalry between the United States and Great Britain in the Pacific Ocean. That is to say, perhaps American interests in Hawaii did not wish to see too many British subjects on Hawaiian soil. The entry of Asian Indian immigrants into the continental United States was terminated by the 1917 Barred Zone Act, which drew an imaginary line around a roughly triangular area in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. Asians who lived within the Barred Zone, which stretched from Arabia all the way to New Guinea, and included within its boundaries Afghanistan, the Indian subcontinent, and all of mainland and insular Southeast Asia, were to be excluded from further immigration.¹⁷

The last group of Asian immigrants to enter during the first wave period was the Filipinos. The United States had colonized the Philippines in 1898. A few years later, United States policy encouraged Filipino youths to go to the United States for education. The American colonial administration needed low-echelon clerks and other persons to fill the colonial administrative

bureaucracy. It was thought that sending Filipino youth to study in the United States would not only train the requisite manpower, but would also introduce Filipinos to the ideals of American democracy and the American way of life. While some of the students went under government scholarship, others went with the hope of working their way through school. Some never made it and became domestic servants and farmworkers.

By the early 1920's, the exclusion of Japanese immigrants made Hawaii sugar planters and California growers fear an impending labor shortage. These growers looked to the Philippines as a new source of labor, for since the Philippines was a territory of the United States, no immigration restriction was in effect. Residents of the Philippines were considered to be American nationals. As "wards" of the United States, Filipinos were free to travel back and forth between the Philippines and Hawaii (another U. S. territory) as well as the United States. Filipino mass immigration reached its zenith in the years just before the Great Depression. However, the desperate economic conditions of the Depression, together with anti-Filipino sentiment which had reached violent proportions by 1930, set in motion the movement to terminate Filipino immigration. It is interesting to note that some of the very persons who were most opposed to Filipino immigration became champions of the move to grant independence to the Philippines. It was reasoned that if the Philippines became a sovereign nation, then her citizen could be barred from further entry under the laws which were already in existence. In 1934, what was essentially a compromise was made: while the Philippines was not granted full political independence, she was granted Commonwealth status. One clause of the Tydings-McDuffie Act limited Filipino immigration henceforth to fifty persons per year.¹⁸

The treatment of Filipino immigrants set the historical precedent for

how the United States has treated other U. S. nationals from her territorial possessions in recent decades. Of relevance to our discussion here are the conditions surrounding the migration of Pacific Islanders into the United States today. Pacific Islanders from Guam and American Samoa travel with U. S. passports but they do not enjoy the rights of citizenship. Moreover, their homelands are subjected to the same kind of colonial domination and economic control which the Philippines experienced in the past, and to some extent, still experiences today. Whether explicitly admitted or not, American political and economic interests are paramount, and are never forgotten when discussions take place of what public policy should be applied to the Pacific Islands and their peoples today.

The period between 1934 to 1965, when second wave immigrants were coming in can be divided into two sub-periods: before and after 1943. Prior to 1943, exclusion of Asian immigrants was official U. S. immigration policy. In 1943, as a gesture of goodwill towards China (which was then fighting on the side of the Allies against Japan), the U. S. Congress rescinded the Chinese Exclusion Law.¹⁹ It was only a token gesture, however, for thereafter, only one hundred and five immigrants per year could enter. Moreover, anyone with half Chinese blood was chargeable to the Chinese quota. After the war, in 1946, bills were also passed which permitted a similar token number of Filipinos and Asian Indians to enter.²⁰ It was not until 1952 that Japanese and Korean immigration was allowed to resume (also on a token basis.)²¹

During this period, the bulk of the Asians who did immigrate did so as non-quota immigrants. Three kinds of people came: students, spouses and dependents of Americans, and political refugees. In addition, an unknown number of persons entered illegally by various means, such as jumping ship, or clandestinely crossing the Mexican and Canadian borders. Students were

required to go back to their home countries after completing their studies, but a miniscule number did manage to stay. Spouses and dependents of Americans made their appearance primarily after World War II, for most of the Americans bringing back Asian family members had been servicemen. The number of spouses and dependents coming in varied. Between 1948 and 1965, almost six thousand Asian Indian dependents came in.²² Non-quota immigrants from China, Korea and the Philippines ranged from around one thousand persons from each country per year in the late 1940's to almost three thousand per year by the early 1960's. The influx of political refugees was also a post-World War II phenomenon. By far, the largest contingent came from China after the Communists came to power. Under the 1948 Displaced Persons Act, 3,500 Chinese who claimed they could not return to China "because of fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion" were allowed to adjust their visitor status to become permanent residents. In 1953, 2,000 Chinese entered under a Refugee Act. The Refugee Act of 1957 and the Act of September 22, 1959, enabled another 1,000 Chinese to enter. Finally, between 1962 and 1967, a total of 15,000 Chinese refugees entered under the provisions of the Presidential Directive which John F. Kennedy had signed in 1962.²³

In terms of socio-economic background, the second wave immigrants differed considerably from the first wave. Almost all the students and political refugees came from privileged backgrounds — they were either people who came from families which could afford to send their children for higher education, or they had sufficient wealth and power to fear persecution under a Communist government. The wives of returning veterans generally came from lower class levels, for some of the women became acquainted with American servicemen precisely because they had to work in bars and similar places

because their families were poor.²⁴

After arrival in the United States, second wave immigrants settled in a much more dispersed pattern than did first wave immigrants. The expatriate intellectuals found jobs in universities and in defense-related industries which were located in many different parts of the country. For the first time, Asian immigrants began to buy homes in white neighborhoods, and Asian children attended integrated public schools. The "success" with which many members of the second wave immigrants integrated into American society gave rise eventually to a new stereotype of Asian Americans — that of the "successful minority." A recent study has shown that the acceptance accorded some of this batch of immigrants — particularly those of Chinese ancestry — had less to do with the "opening up" of American society than with the high socio-economic level of the immigrants themselves. That is to say, their own upper class backgrounds and western education prepared them well for living in America.²⁵

The Act of October 3, 1965, which ushered in the present era of Asian immigration, took effect on July 1, 1968. The eastern hemisphere was allocated a total quota of 170,000 persons per year, while the western hemisphere was allocated a quota of 120,000 persons per year. In all cases, a labor clearance was required. The act set up a visa allocation system based on six preferences, plus an additional non-preference category for other qualified persons. Preference 1 is for unmarried sons and daughters of U. S. citizens, preference 2 is for spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens, preference 3 is for members of the professions, scientists and artists, preference 4 is for married sons and daughters of U. S. citizens, preference 5 is for brothers and sisters of U. S. citizens, preference 6 is for skilled or unskilled workers needed by the United States economy at a

particular time, and preference 7 is for refugees and other qualified applicants. At present, although the quota for any single country is 20,000, in fact, there are more than 20,000 persons coming in from certain Asian countries, for some persons are able to come in on a non-quota basis. The major Asian groups now entering are Filipinos, Koreans, Chinese and Asian Indians. (Vietnamese have entered as refugees, not regular immigrants.) The present system is under review. The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy has recommended that applicants be lumped together into just two categories: those who wish to immigrate for family reunification, and those who are independent immigrants. For the world as a whole, a ceiling of 350,000 immigrants per year has been recommended.

Today's Asian immigrants are dispersing all over the United States, although they still tend to concentrate mainly in the metropolitan areas of the east coast and west coast, and in selected areas of the midwest and the south. As a matter of fact, in the last decade, the south has received significant numbers of Asian immigrants for the first time. The existence of many defense-based aerospace industries in the Houston area has drawn many Asian American engineers and scientists to the area. In addition, fishing opportunities in the Gulf coast area have attracted sizable numbers of Vietnamese refugees. California still has the largest Asian-ancestry population, followed by Hawaii and New York. The 1980 census counted three and a half million Asian-ancestry persons in the United States.

The motives impelling today's Asian immigrants are quite varied. According to information gathered by this writer from interviews with Asian immigrant students on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley, the two most frequently cited motivations for immigration are the desire for a "better life" and the desire to escape political instability in the countries of

origin. Interestingly enough, although U. S. immigration policy stresses the humane desire to reunite hitherto separated families, many of the immigrants see family reunification more as a mechanism which makes immigration possible than as a motivating cause for migration per se. Many of the interviewees were too young to have participated in their families' decision to immigrate. Thus, they have only a vague notion of what their parents considered to be a "better life." The most often cited aspect of a better life is the availability of higher education in tax-supported public colleges and universities. (However, this response may not be representative of the Asian immigrant population as a whole, for in the case of the students who were being interviewed, the very fact that they are now students at a prestigious public university would lead them to assume that their parents' concern for their future was an important pull factor in their families' decision to immigrate into the United States.) The students were all aware of the difficulty of obtaining a college education in Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong. In contrast, higher education is much more accessible in the Philippines — a country with a large number of institutions of higher learning.

A "better life" is also interpreted to mean opportunities to earn reliable and steady incomes. Immigrants from upper or middle class backgrounds tend to view this question differently from those of lower class backgrounds. Children from lower class families said they thought it was easier to get jobs in the United States, although most were aware that their parents, relatives and older siblings do not always manage to get desirable jobs. Many more of the students' mothers now work than they did in Asia. Also, those students who have found well-paid part-time jobs sometimes mentioned that such part-time work isn't available in many Asian countries. A small number of respondents said their parents have noted it is easier to buy real property

here, given the relatively more liberal credit system in the United States. In particular, those from working class families are proud they own their own homes, and in some cases, several cars. Comparatively speaking, immigrants from lower class families who have succeeded in finding work, housing and education for their children feel the quality of life in the United States is better than that in the countries where they came from. In contrast, it is frequently individuals from middle or upper class backgrounds who do not speak English well and who do not have sufficient capital to become successful entrepreneurs who suffer downward social mobility after arrival in the United States. Such individuals experience the greatest problems in social adjustment and are least likely to have a sanguine view of life in America.

Immigrants from Taiwan, Korea and the Philippines sometimes mention that one motivation for emigration was the unstable political situations in their countries of origin. They were reluctant, however, to elaborate on what this means. The largest group of persons who have come for political reasons, of course, are the refugees from Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. To date, over 400,000 Indochinese refugees have entered the United States. Only a small number of these persons have obtained American citizenship, and many are still legally stateless.

From the above discussion, it is apparent that the Asian immigrants coming in today aren't so different from the generations of immigrants who have landed on America's shores in the last three centuries. The American dream may be somewhat tarnished, but as a lodestone, it hasn't completely lost its luster.

Community Structure, Inter-ethnic Relations and Cultural Development

To the outsider, Asian American communities may seem to be replicas of communities in the immigrants' countries of origin — witness nomenclature such as Chinatown, Nihonmachi and Manilatown — but in reality, there are significant differences between the culture and social structure of the societies the immigrants came from on the one hand, and the culture and social structure of the new communities the immigrants created on American soil on the other hand. Asian American culture and community structure are the hybrid result of the interaction of several historical ingredients: the "cultural baggage" brought over from the countries of origin, the nineteenth-century frontier culture of the American West, the interaction between Asian immigrants and Euro-Americans and the behavioral modalities which resulted from such interaction, and the immigrants' own creative adaptation for survival in America. In the early period, most of the immigrants came from the villages of rural Asia to work in a rapidly industrializing society in North America; today, almost all the immigrants come from highly urbanized Asian cities to live and work in an economy which is increasingly characterized as a high technology, post-industrial one.

Three "unnatural" aspects of pre-World War II Asian American communities will be noted here. First, very few members of the traditional Asian elites emigrated. Since members of the elite possessed wealth, status and power, there was little incentive for them to emigrate. Thus, in the American setting, those individuals who formed the nascent elite group in the new immigrant communities were persons who did not possess elite status prior to immigration. In Chinese American and Japanese American communities, merchants (who had money but low status in traditional Asia) became the most powerful individuals in their communities. Their power derived from their

possession and control of material resources as well as manpower. They frequently acted as their communities' spokespersons, and it was their role as intermediaries between their fellow countrymen and white American society which served as the foundation for their preeminence.²⁶ In Korean American, Asian Indian, and Filipino American communities, there were few merchants. The elite position in the latter three communities was usually occupied by students and other literate persons. Among Korean, Asian Indian and Filipino immigrants, educated persons who were politically active in efforts to fight for their countries' independence from colonial domination were considered to be their communities' leaders.²⁷

Second, prior to the contemporary period, few women emigrated from Asia to the United States. One reason was that traditional Asian culture frowned upon women travelling; another reason was that most immigrants came to work and frequently, labor recruiters were not eager to recruit women (except as prostitutes); yet another reason was that few immigrants could afford the fare to bring wives and children over. For the most part, therefore, first wave Asian immigrants lived in a bachelor society. It is a characteristic of many non-Asian immigrant groups, also, for young men to serve as the vanguard of immigration. In this, Asian immigrants were not so peculiar. What happened to Asian immigrants which was unnatural was that in most cases, immigration restrictions were imposed approximately three decades after immigration commenced for each group, so that just around the time when it would have been natural for the men to send for the women and children, their opportunity to do so was foreclosed by exclusionary legislation. Communities inhabited by many men and few women usually show certain characteristics: there is a certain amount of rowdy drunkenness and driftlessness, and gambling houses and brothels tend to proliferate. In this

respect, early Asian American communities were true frontier communities. They differed only in the length of time that such frontier characteristics persisted, through no intention of their own.

Third, the natural development of Asian American communities was coercively circumscribed by racist discrimination. Asian Americans have suffered from six different kinds of racial discrimination: prejudice, discriminatory legislation, harassment and violence, physical and social segregation, immigration exclusion and internment in camps during World War II.

Even prior to the coming of the first wave immigrants, negative stereotypes of Asians had already been formed in the minds of some Americans who were aware of the existence of Asia and Asians. Americans' stereotypes of the Chinese were most developed. On the one hand, the Chinese people were seen as members of a great, though rapidly declining, civilization. On the other hand, Chinese were seen to be heathens who stubbornly resisted Christian proselytization, treacherous killers of missionaries and xenophobic attackers of foreigners, and masses of half-starving, disease-ridden toiling humanity slaving under a despotic government. Such negative stereotypes of the Chinese had a profound impact on the attitudes of Americans towards Chinese immigrants.²⁸ Though the prejudiced stereotypes of the Chinese carried over to the later groups of Asian immigrants who came, Americans did add some additional elements to their perceptions of the Japanese, who were seen as ambitious and sneaky. Filipinos, for their part, were perceived to be uncivilized, and were frequently referred to as "monkeys."

Prejudice against Asians derived from two sources. First, Americans were part of the western efforts to colonize or otherwise penetrate the Asian continent. Though the United States has been frequently seen as relatively the least rapacious of the western powers, nonetheless, the United States did

benefit from the system of international inequality which had developed in Asia by the middle of the nineteenth century. Thus, the American tendency to see Asians as inferior beings had an objective basis in the international relations between the United States and various Asian countries. Second, the manner in which white settlers had treated other persons of color in the United States also affected the attitude of the American public towards Asian immigrants. By the time Asian immigrants started arriving, white settlers had fought countless wars against Native American Indians, had enslaved Africans brought to work on American plantations, and had acquired a vast tract of Mexican territory after the Mexican-American War. Asian immigrants were simply seen as another group of dark skinned persons to be exploited.

Prejudice becomes really harmful when it is institutionalized in the legal system and patterns of social action of a society, because the efforts required to remove such structural barriers become immense. The legal system of a country reflects its values. Acceptable and unacceptable modes of behavior are defined, and the coercive powers of the state are applied to sanction what is acceptable and to punish what is considered to be criminal. When racist feelings against Asian immigrants became strong, the federal, state and municipal legal systems were used to deprive Asian immigrants of basic human rights.

Some laws and ordinances directed against Asian Americans were capricious and aimed at symbolic cultural differences, such as the efforts to cut off the queues worn by the early Chinese immigrants. Other laws were aimed at driving Asian immigrants out of certain occupations. For example, California passed many laws which prohibited the use of Chinese-style fishing nets, or the export of dried marine products. Hand laundries, which were mostly owned by Asian immigrants, were taxed more heavily than mechanized

laundries, which were owned mainly by caucasians.²⁹ Asian immigrants were also not allowed to purchase agricultural land in California and ten other states.³⁰ In the mid-1920's, in the state of New York, there were laws and ordinances which prohibited Asian-ancestry persons from pursuing some twenty-seven separate occupations.³¹

The right of naturalization was also denied to Asian immigrants.³² This denial meant that Asian immigrants were forever disenfranchised. Consequently, they had no political power. Therefore, unlike European immigrants, they could not make use of the machinery of the party system to cast block votes and gain some political leverage. Thus, Asian immigrants became convenient scapegoats for politicians who wanted to exploit anti-Asian sentiment for their own ends. Moreover, since the countries of origin of Asian immigrants were weak — Japan being a sole exception — the immigrants' home governments could do nothing to protect their rights.

Asian immigrants could not resort to the courts to protect their rights in the period between 1854 and 1872, because an 1850 statute which prohibited Blacks and Native Americans from testifying against white persons in court was made applicable to Asian immigrants by the Supreme Court in 1854. Anti-miscegenation laws prevented Asian immigrants from marrying caucasians, so after immigration exclusion went into effect, those Asian immigrants who chose to remain in America but who had not brought wives over with them were forced to live out the rest of their lives as lonely bachelors.

As though discriminatory legislation were insufficient to drive Asians out, physical violence was often used to keep Asian immigrants "in their place." The earliest instance of physical violence against Asian immigrants occurred in the gold mining camps of California. Groups of white miners often drove Chinese miners out of good claims which the Chinese miners had discovered

and were working. A Foreign Miners' Tax, technically levied on all foreign miners, was in effect collected only from the Chinese. Some tax collectors did not hesitate to use physical intimidation against Chinese miners to collect a little extra revenue for themselves.

Between 1871, when an anti-Chinese massacre occurred in Los Angeles, and 1910, when mobs attacked Asian Indians laborers in Bellingham, Washington, a series of attacks against Asian communities took place.³³ After a period of calm in the 1910's, anti-Filipino riots broke out in 1929 and 1930 in California.³⁴ These incidents were seldom investigated. In those rare instances when persons were apprehended and tried, they were usually acquitted. Property damage was almost never compensated. In fact, the only case when damages were paid was the massacre of Chinese coal miners at Rock Springs, Wyoming, in 1886. In this case, the federal government was so embarrassed by the outbreak of mob violence that the survivors were compensated.

Discriminatory legislation and physical violence did not succeed in driving Asian immigrants out of the country completely. So segregation was used as a means to keep Asian immigrants contained in their own ghettoized communities.³⁵ First Chinese school children, and later Japanese school children — including those who were American-born and therefore were full-fledged American citizens — were segregated in "Oriental Schools."³⁶ The board of realtors of many communities also worked hard to prevent Asian immigrants and even American-born Asians from buying homes outside of the delineated ghetto areas. Over time, the social and physical segregation of Asian Americans became partly self-imposed, for safety was found in sticking with one's own kind. The irony was that Asian Americans were then criticized for being "clannish" and for being incapable of being assimilated.

We have already mentioned the various immigration exclusion acts, so there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice it to say that exclusion would have brought about the complete demise of Asian American communities had it not been for the occasional lifting of immigration restriction to allow certain groups of persons in under special legislation.

Japanese Americans suffered an additional injustice during World War II when 112,000 persons of Japanese ancestry — two-thirds of whom were American citizens — were interned in concentration camps. These persons were charged with no crime. They were interned solely on the basis of their racial origin. When World War II broke out, persons of German, Italian and Japanese ancestry who were not then American citizens were declared to be "enemy aliens." However, of the three groups of enemy aliens, only those of Japanese ancestry were interned. The United States army and government argued that Japanese Americans were taken into protective custody out of "military necessity." A number of compelling recent studies have shown, however, that the "fact" of military necessity was a questionable one.³⁷ The internment was not an aberration dictated by wartime hysteria, as some observers have argued. If we are aware of the entire history of anti-Asian sentiment and actions in United States history, we can see that the internment of Japanese Americans was simply the culmination of a century of racism against many different groups of colored people in the United States.

Asian American culture reflects the history of racism against Asian Americans. On the one hand, Asian Americans learned that for the sake of survival, we must be quiet, non-obtrusive, and accepting of discrimination and subordination. As a matter of fact, Asian Americans in recent decades have been lauded as a "model minority" — that is to say, people who manage to "make it" by dint of non-complaining hard work. The "successful minority"

model was held up for more militant minority groups to emulate. At the same time, there has also always been a counter-strand of resistance among Asian Americans. Asian Americans fought the injustice meted out to us by participating in strikes, protest marches and law suits, many of which went all the way to the United States Supreme Court. These twin strands have become intimately woven into the fabric of Asian American culture and community life.

Culture is usually understood in two ways. There is what is sometimes called "high culture," which refers to the literary and artistic products of a civilization. Outsiders, and even many Asian Americans themselves, frequently confuse the literary and artistic products of Asia with those produced by Asian immigrants in America. The two are not synonymous. The latter reflects a special sensibility which inheres in the American experience of Asian immigrants and their descendants. Until recent years, there were relatively few items of such high culture produced within our communities. The last two decades have witnessed a virtual artistic and literary renaissance in Asian American communities, with myriad works of varying artistic merit produced by Asian Americans. However, only in metropolitan areas with large Asian American populations, such as New York, Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles, have Asian American artistic products found sufficient support to be publicly produced or performed. Moreover, it is only in these places that a small number of such cultural products has been reviewed by critics, and been introduced to non-Asian American audiences.

The aspect of culture which has been noticed more by outsiders is the kind of culture which anthropologists study. That is to say, it is Asian American values, norms of interpersonal behavior and social action which have received comment. The tenacity of Asian American family life and community

institutions has been of particular interest to outside observers. We have frequently been charged with being incapable of assimilation precisely because our cultural mores seem so unchanging. Yet, modifications have occurred. If they had not, there wouldn't exist the oft-touted "identity problem" among Asian American youth. Only individuals who have a knowledge of two or more conflicting ways of life experience cultural conflicts. In our communities, inter-generational conflict (which is a normal feature found in any community) becomes exacerbated by cultural conflict. Painful as such conflicts may be, they can also serve positive functions, for they reflect the attempts of individuals to wrestle and come to terms with cultural adaptation and social change. To the extent that old world values have persisted, some Asian Americans tend to be more mindful of authority, less assertive in public, and seemingly more in need of social acceptance than the stereotypical middle class caucasian American. While some observers have faulted Asian Americans for these personality traits, one cannot help but wonder whether in today's world of crisis, the possession of these traits by all youth to a greater degree may not be a desideratum.

Contemporary Issues.

Media images of Asian Americans as "successful minorities"³⁸ notwithstanding, Asian Americans remain true minorities today. That is to say, Asian-ancestry persons still suffer from many disadvantages, and Asian American communities still face many problems. In this section, we shall discuss briefly the issues confronting Asian Americans in the areas of education, employment, health and mental health, community development and the preservation of cultural integrity, and participation in the civic life of this nation.

Education: Asian Americans have been repeatedly noted for their high educational attainment. However, that does not mean there are no educational issues facing Asian Americans today. Unlike some of the other minorities, our problem is not one of simple physical access to the educational system. Rather, the most important educational issues facing Asian Americans today are: 1)the inadequate provision of relevant bilingual-bicultural education, 2)the tracking of Asian American students into narrow fields of study — primarily into the technical professions, 3)the poor linkage between educational attainment on the one hand, and earnings and upward social mobility on the other hand, and 4)the lack of Asian American input into the decision-making process in the formulation of educational policies at the local, state and federal levels.³⁹

When immigrant children enter the schooling system after their families' arrival in the United States, if there are no bilingual teachers, teachers' aides, or programs available, what happens is that the children are essentially condemned to several years of non-education in the classroom. The children are forced to pick up whatever English they can simply through listening and

and in a somewhat haphazard manner. If the children are young, they manage to do so relatively successfully without formal help, but research in second-language acquisition has shown that beyond early puberty, this process of natural language acquisition no longer works. Immigrant students whom this writer has interviewed stated that it took them between one to three years after initial arrival to begin to understand what was going on in the world around them. Without bilingual programs, it means that during this initial period, such children receive no education in those subjects which require a knowledge of English. Worse, the children are probably experiencing profound social isolation. Somewhat miraculously, some of these students manage to develop their quantitative reasoning skills, and it may be speculated that their ability to function in math may be what keeps such children from being irretrievably stunted in their intellectual development.

In districts where bilingual (indeed, multi-lingual) programs exist, the nature of the programs vary, and their quality varies even more greatly. Unfortunately, we do not yet have adequate research findings to indicate which programs seem to work more effectively and why they do so. The major point to be remembered with regard to the very controversial issue of bilingual education is that the parents of immigrant children are also workers and tax payers — even though many of them may not have become American citizens yet. As tax payers, they are entitled to have educational programs which serve the specific needs of their children. Education cannot be said to be equal for a particular group of children if they have physical, but not mental and social access to what is being taught in the schools.⁴⁰ And perhaps even more importantly from a philosophical point of view, if immigrant children are educated in such a way that they are forced to assimilate and to reject the norms and values of their ethnic heritage, then we as educators must question the very philosophical foundations of this country's educational

system — the most fundamental question being: Whose needs does the educational system serve?

Of those Asian American students who receive higher education today, a disproportionate number major in engineering and the hard sciences. In contrast, only a miniscule number major in the humanities, and only a relatively small number enter the social sciences. If we distinguish between the foreign-born and the American-born, the unusual distribution of majors and career aspirations is even more striking. The most up-to-date data available come from an analysis of all Asian-ancestry undergraduates at the University of California at Berkeley, where over 20 percent of the undergraduate population (or some five thousand students) are now of Asian ancestry. Among foreign-born Asian-ancestry students, 40 percent of those who have not yet acquired U. S. citizenship major in engineering, and an additional 15 percent major in the physical sciences. Among the foreign-born who have acquired citizenship, the percentages are 23 percent and 14 percent respectively. For American-born students of Asian ancestry, only 17 percent are in engineering, while an additional 10 percent are in the physical sciences. In contrast, among non-Asian undergraduates, only 10 percent are in engineering, and only 11 percent are in the physical sciences. The opposite picture appears when we look at the humanities: only 3 percent of the foreign-born, and only 6 percent of the American-born, choose humanities majors, compared to 16 percent of the non-Asian undergraduates who are humanities majors. A similar (though less pronounced) negative selection of the social sciences is also evident. Among the foreign-born, 8 percent are social science majors; among the American-born, 16 percent are social science majors; while among non-Asians, 30 percent are social science majors.⁴¹ Interview data indicate a very strong correlation between Asian American students' choice of majors and their career aspirations.

It may be argued that in today's high technology economy, engineering and the hard sciences are the very fields with the best employment opportunities, so why should Asian American students' career preferences be a concern? Isn't their very ability to succeed in these fields a validation of the view that Asian Americans are successful? Those educators who see the educational and career patterns of our students as a cause for concern believe that it is not socially "healthy" to have a community full of technicians. We need persons who are concerned with the larger issues of social life and human existence. More to the point, we need to inculcate in our youth a desire to work in areas which serve the needs of their community members. In short, we desire to have a more balanced community whose members pursue careers and work across a wide spectrum of employment opportunities.

Despite the seeming success of Asian Americans to enter "desirable" white collar technical professions, if we take a careful look at the data on individual income, we shall see there is a poorer correlation between the educational attainment level of Asian Americans and their individual earnings than the correlation found in the comparable population among whites. Unfortunately, data from the 1980 census are not yet available for analysis, so we still have to rely on the 1970 census data. Part of the "successful minority" myth was based on the high average household income of the Asian American population as revealed in the 1970 census. However, once this average household income is adjusted for the disproportionately high percentage of multiple income earners within Asian American families, and once adjustment is also made for the localities within which the majority of Asian Americans live (i.e., concentration in the five metropolitan areas of San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York, Chicago and Hawaii, which are high-income but also high-cost-of-living areas), then the earnings gap of Asian Americans vis-a-vis their educational attainment levels becomes readily apparent. A

recent study found that in 1970, there was a significantly lower educational pay-off for Filipino and Korean males when compared to white males, with an earnings ratio of 0.63 for those with a college degree, and an earnings ratio of 0.70 for those with five years or more of college. For those with a high school education, the earnings ratio was 0.80 for Filipino males and 0.90 for Korean males. For those with less than a high school education, the ratio was 0.80 for Chinese males and 0.86 for Korean males. The Asian female to white male earnings ratio was only 0.50 for all levels of educational attainment. Compared to white women, Asian women still earn less.⁴² What this study indicates is that the more education Asian Americans receive, the larger is the gap between their actual earnings to predicted earnings when compared to their white male counterparts.

The preponderance of Asian Americans in the technical fields, and the poor linkage between their educational attainment levels and earnings may be a result of the fourth problem facing Asian Americans in the area of education today, and that is, there are hardly any Asian Americans occupying high positions in policy-making bodies in education. Few Asian Americans serve on local school boards; few Asian Americans outside of Hawaii and the two California metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco serve as school administrators; few Asian Americans work in educational units in the state bureaucracy, and those who do are probably serving in technical, rather than policy-making capacities; and almost no Asian Americans are in high decision-making positions in the federal government. As a result, the Asian American voice simply isn't heard when it comes to policies which have an impact on the educational future of our children. The only times when our concerns are heard are when we file lawsuits to demand for our rights.

Employment: In terms of occupational distribution, the Asian American population shows a bimodal pattern. That is to say, we have a sizable

proportion of persons in the professional and technical fields, but we have an even larger "lump" working in poorly paid, insecure, non-unionized menial work. In fact, those old-timers who never managed to surmount racist barriers, as well as new immigrants who do not speak English well, have almost no choice except to be relegated to menial service work, or to the operation of small-scale, low-return businesses. The major issue in the area of employment for Asian Americans is underemployment. Many Asian immigrants with good educational backgrounds simply aren't able to find work commensurate with their training. This results in tragedy not only for the individuals concerned, but represents an enormous waste of manpower resources. It is ironic that persons with professional training are given preference for immigration, but after their arrival here, there are few mechanisms for channeling them into productive employment. Licensing requirements, especially, represent a steep barrier for Asian immigrant professionals. Frequently, as the immigrants study for their certification examinations, they must also earn a living and support families. The process is so arduous that many give up.

Among the seemingly fortunate ones who do find employment, a detailed analysis of employment patterns in the San Francisco Bay Area found that in the professions, Asian Americans tend to cluster in accounting, dentistry, nursing and health technology, and engineering. They are not found in parity numbers in law, teaching, administration, the social sciences, or the higher levels of the medical professions. In management, they tend to be self-employed, and few work as buyers, sales managers or other types of managers in firms owned by others. As salesworkers, Asian Americans tend to be retail sales clerks, but are not brokers or insurance agents. As clerical workers, they are mostly file clerks, typists or office machine operators, but are not secretaries or receptionists. In the operatives category, we find mostly Asian women garment workers. Few Asian American males or females

are employed in the heavy machines, electrical, paper or chemical industries. Asian Americans are also conspicuously absent in the building trades. Thus, Asian Americans are not only clustered into certain sectors of the economy, but even within these sectors, they are limited to certain occupations.⁴³ Many of these occupations do not require contact with the public, and are relatively less well-paid.

Even for those Asian immigrants who seem to have succeeded in establishing businesses, the real picture is actually not so rosy. Asian American "Mom and Pop" enterprises manage to survive only because of the extensive use of unpaid family labor, and the acceptance of very low returns. Census data in this regard are again misleading. Though the percentage of the gainfully employed Asian American population in "management and business" seems unusually high, in reality, the majority of them are engaged in retail trade and in selected services. In 1972, among these firms, more than one-half were classified as "without paid employees," and showed very low gross receipts.⁴⁴

Employment problems are especially pronounced for certain subgroups within the Asian American population. These include recent immigrants who do not know the English language well, the elderly, female heads of households, and youth who have dropped out of school, as well as the more recent waves of Indochinese refugees who — in contrast to the first batch who entered in 1975 and who were well educated and had occupied relatively privileged positions prior to the fall of their home governments — are less well educated, come from poorer backgrounds, and in the case of the Hmong mountain tribesmen, are quite unfamiliar with modern life.⁴⁵

In the case of each of the above subgroups, the lack of job training or re-training is a severe hindrance to finding productive employment. Lack of adequate information about the job market — especially in a recessionary

period — causes many aspiring job seekers to give up and to either seek welfare or fall back on the support of more fortunate family members. Given the traditional reluctance of Asians to seek public welfare, in reality, much of the community's unemployment and underemployment problems are camouflaged, for the "slack" is absorbed by the community itself. So the image that Asian Americans have no problems and "take care of their own" is perpetuated, and the community loses out in terms of federal, state and local assistance programs.

Health and Mental Health: Beliefs about health and mental health are culturally determined, so one of the major issues facing Asian Americans in this area is that problems are often misinterpreted or misdiagnosed by health professionals who are unfamiliar with the cultural backgrounds of their Asian clients. Moreover, if the health professionals cannot speak the language of the clients they are seeing, then the problems of misunderstanding are compounded. If we adopt a holistic view of health, we would recognize that frequently, a patient's mental attitude may affect the efficacy of certain cures. If the cultural worldviews of the health services providers and their patients differ diametrically, then the lack of psychological congruence may seriously impede the effectiveness of whatever health care is provided.

To our knowledge, Asian Americans as a group do not evince any genetically-linked diseases (such as sickle cell anemia in the case of Blacks), but many of the poorer individuals within Asian American communities show a high incidence of diseases associated with poverty and poor living conditions. For example, an exceptionally large number of the residents of Chinatown in San Francisco suffer from tuberculosis.

Concepts related to mental health are especially problematic because among some Asian American subpopulations, mental health is equated with the absence of mental illness. That is to say, only when mental health problems

become so obvious that they cannot fail to be observable might individuals seek help, at which point it may be too late. The traditional association of mental illness with insanity has cast taboos on seeking treatment. The fact that traditional Asian cultures are group-oriented, and members of a group (such as an extended family) are held responsible for the action and welfare of other members, means that individuals are constrained from seeking help if they think their doing so will bring shame to the other members of their group. Here again, there is a tendency for problems to be camouflaged and swept under the rug.

Obviously, the availability of bilingual health professionals who are familiar with some of the cultural values and norms related to health problems will be an important step towards meeting the health and mental health needs of Asian Americans. In the case of the elderly and the poor, it is especially important for facilities to be available in the community. The alien atmosphere of hospitals and clinics is enough to turn even the brave person away. When one remembers the cost of medical treatment — and some of the elderly may be unaware of programs such as Medicaid, Medicare and Medical, and some of the recent arrivals may be ineligible for these programs — then it is understandable that many Asian Americans who may need treatment simply do not get any. A recent study by the Pacific/Asian Elderly Project argued strongly in favor of the provision of health and social services within the community by Asian/Pacific community service agencies using Asian/Pacific American professionals.⁴⁶ Moreover, a number of other studies have shown that in many instances, western medical practices may be used quite successfully in combination with traditional Asian medical approaches.

Community Development, Cultural Integrity and Civic Participation: Prior to the 1950's, it was relatively easy to identify Asian American communities because a large proportion of our population lived in segregated areas and

interracial marriage was relatively rare. Today, however, Asian American communities have become difficult to define. When we say "community," are we referring only to a geographic clustering of people in close proximity to each other, or are we referring to a socio-economic phenomenon wherein members of a group recognize they have something in common with each other regardless of where they may be located physically? If we take the narrow geographic definition of the term, we run the danger of excluding the majority of the Asian American population today, for nowadays, most Asian Americans do not live in exclusively (or even predominantly) Asian neighborhoods. The problem of what constitutes Asian American communities is compounded by the fact that members of a group may not perceive themselves in the same way as outsiders perceive them. That is to say, there exists both an etic (outsider's) view, as well as an emic (insider's) view of any community, particularly ethnic minority ones.

In the case of Euro-Americans, the children of the original immigrants have been able to blend into majority society with relative ease due to the physical resemblance of the groups concerned. For Asian immigrants and their children, however, our physical distinctiveness is an ever-present reminder that we look different, and the question then arises, if we look different, do we also feel differently about our membership in American society?

There is a whole continuum of views regarding the cultural, social and political identity and affinity of Asian Americans. Even today, few caucasian or black or Hispanic Americans seem to regard Asian Americans — even those of the third, fourth or fifth generations — as "real" Americans. Many Asian Americans themselves feel ambivalent about who they are. At one end of the continuum, there are those Asian Americans who insist we are Americans first, and such persons even oppose the use of the qualifying adjective "Asian." They insist we should try to assimilate as much as possible, so that we can be

accepted fully by other Americans. At the polar extreme are individuals who advocate that since white Americans will never accept us as equals anyway, we might as well insist on, and be proud of, our different ethnic heritage. Somewhere in the middle stand those who say we should regard the United States as our permanent home: we should work for our rights as citizens, but at the same time, we should do everything possible to preserve our cultural heritage. Such persons see the development of a true Asian American culture (which is neither solely Asian nor solely Euro-American) and the development of our communities as vehicles for the realization of our individual as well as group integrity.

When we speak of cultural integrity, we do not mean to argue that we must retain every aspect of our old cultures without modification. We recognize that many aspects of our old cultures are not only dysfunctional in modern society but are in fact repressive and ought to be challenged. A case in point is the misogynous attitude towards women which many traditional Asian cultures promote. However, it is quite a different thing for Asian Americans ourselves to reject certain facets of our cultural heritage than for outsiders to discriminate against us on the basis of our racial and cultural origins. In other words, what we reject is forcible assimilation into Euro-American norms. Asian Americans would like to do the selection of what to retain and what to reject ourselves. Autonomy of cultural development is an important part of social integrity.

Similarly, when we speak of community development, we are not favoring the continued ghettoization of our people. While we would like to see our communities achieve some degree of economic and social viability, we are also arguing that the members of our communities must participate actively in the civic life of the larger society in which we live. We want bilingual ballots and bilingual programs precisely because we want our community's

members to have access to the social, political and economic life around them. When people come to a new country in late adolescence or adulthood, it is not always possible for them to learn a new language quickly or well. But those who do not succeed in learning English adequately should not be condemned to perpetual social isolation and marginality.

Ultimately, in the view of this writer, who is an Asian American and who belongs to the Asian American community is based on self-identification. Those of mixed racial/ethnic parentage, in particular, have to make their own choices. What we must avoid is dogma in our attempts to determine the direction of development of our communities and our culture. Perhaps the most important thing Asian Americans of all backgrounds agree on is that we want to improve the quality of life for all our people.⁴⁷ This means better housing, more jobs in a greater range of occupations, relevant bilingual services within easy access, and sufficient political power to have some say about our future vis-a-vis the formulation and implementation of public policy at all different levels.

Asian Americans' Perception of and Attitude towards Pacific Islanders.

Although Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans have been grouped together under a single rubric, and although the number of Pacific Islanders in a state such as California is rapidly increasing, most Asian Americans are quite ignorant about Pacific Islanders. When questioned, few Asian Americans can name the major Pacific Islander groups now living in the United States. A number of elderly Chinese Americans who read Chinese-language newspapers, for example, told this writer that they know the term "Asian Pacific" ("Ah-tai" in Chinese — "ah" for the Asian continent, and "tai" for "Taiping Yang," the Pacific Ocean) but they had no idea what kind of people live in the Pacific Ocean and of those, what groups have immigrated here. If Asian Americans do not even know who Pacific Islanders are, then

naturally, they would know little, if anything, about the history and culture of Pacific Islanders. This sad state of ignorance is true not only of the public but of scholars as well. Unfortunately, this includes scholars who teach in Asian American Studies programs. There are only two exceptions to this rule. One is that some social service providers who work in the community are aware of the existence of Pacific Islanders, especially Samoans, mainly because they encounter Pacific Islanders as clients. The other is that a small number of staff members in Asian American Studies programs in southern California are sufficiently aware of Pacific Islanders as to include some materials on the latter groups in their courses, because Pacific Islanders are most numerous in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

This state of affairs, though deplorable, is not surprising. Since the number of Pacific Islander students in institutions of higher learning is small indeed, Asian American students and faculty members have had little contact with Pacific Islanders on college campuses. At the University of California at Berkeley, for example, out of some 5,000 Asian Pacific American undergraduates, there are only fifteen self-identified students of Pacific Islander ancestry. Nine out of the fifteen are American-born. At UCLA, there are only twenty-four self-identified Pacific Islander students, twenty of whom are American-born. In short, in stark contrast to Asian immigrant students, young people from immigrant or migrant Pacific Islander families hardly make it into the University of California system at all. In all probability, their numbers in the California State Colleges and Universities system, or even in the community colleges, are not too much greater. Therefore, the only public arenas in which Asian Americans encounter Pacific Islander Americans are in units within the federal, state and local social service delivery system, and perhaps in certain sectors of the world of work.

Given this state of affairs, no matter how anthropologists may be able

to show certain similarities between the social structure of Asian American communities and Pacific Islander communities, there is little likelihood that members of these two umbrella groups will identify with each other as kindred groups. With regard to the issue of whether the two umbrella groups should continue to be aggregated, it is safe to say that most Asian Americans have no opinion at all on the subject. Most Asian Americans are unaware of how the two umbrella groups got lumped together in the first place. We have a hard enough time convincing older members of our population that they are "Asian Americans" rather than "Chinese" or "Korean" or "Vietnamese." Even younger members of the immigrant generation find it difficult to claim they are "Americans," regardless of whether "American" is qualified by some ethnic term.

Only people in Hawaii, and the "old" radicals whose formative years coincided with the heyday of the Asian American movement seem to be aware that the term "Asian Pacific Americans" was coined as a gesture of solidarity, out of a desire to use our combined political strength to fight for resources for our communities. Among Asian Americans, perhaps the Filipino Americans are most able to sympathize with the desire of Pacific Islanders for autonomy and parity, for frequently, Filipino Americans do not identify with immigrants from East Asia and their descendants in America. Filipino Americans often feel their voices are not heard sufficiently within groups which use the Asian American label. The domination of Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans in a lot of activist community groups is too readily apparent. This is especially irking to Filipino Americans who now comprise the largest Asian ethnic group in California. Moreover, in terms of history, Filipino Americans are also the group which has the most in common with Pacific Islanders. The homelands of both have been colonized by the United States, and the political, social, cultural and economic consequences of that historic fact continue to be

felt, and needs to be worked out not only in the lands "back home" but within the immigrant communities established on American soil as well.

The differences between Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are much greater than the similarities between them. Most of the immigrants from Asia today come from highly urbanized localities within industrializing countries. Pacific Islanders, on the other hand, come from societies and economies which are not yet highly urbanized or industrialized. The adjustment Pacific Islanders must make to life in American society is therefore probably much greater than the adjustment which immigrants from Hong Kong, Taipei, Seoul or Manila must make. Consequently, the nature and level of services for Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans must of necessity differ. It is perhaps not inaccurate to say that today, the people with the greatest vested interest in keeping the two groups aggregated are government officials and bureaucrats in funding agencies, for treating the two umbrella groups as one simplifies the work which such people have to do. After all, the more groups one has to deal with, the more complex the political process becomes, the more paperwork is generated, and the more informed and sensitive service providers must be. In today's recessionary economy, with shrinking public resources, there will inevitably be strong resistance to the call for recognizing yet another distinct group which wishes to make separate claims upon public resources. In the opinion of this writer, the fate of the coalition will depend primarily on how Pacific Islanders want things to be, and how much political power they can muster in trying to get legislation changed. Asian Americans have little opinion on the question. Individuals concerned with federal assistance do not see Asian American community-based agencies as either gaining or losing very much regardless of whether Pacific Islanders are amalgamated with Asian Americans or not. We recognize we have a hard enough time, as it is, making even the single label "Asian Americans" meaningful to all those whom the label encompasses. 47

FOOTNOTES

1. There is some disagreement on what to call people from the Philippines. One spelling is "Filipino," while another is "Pilipino." I have chosen to use the "F" here because today, that seems to be the preferred spelling of the majority of Filipinos in the United States. In the 1960's and 70's, the preferred spelling was with the "P."
2. When people from the Indian subcontinent first came to the United States, they were called "Hindoos" -- a word which developed a derogatory connotation. In any case, it was a misnomer, because the majority of the Indian immigrants who came were members of the Sikh religion, not the Hindu religion. In order to distinguish Indians from India from American Indians, the term "East Indians" was adopted by persons who wished to avoid the derogatory nomenclature of "Hindoo." However, this too was a misnomer, because in European colonial history, the "East Indies" referred to the islands of Southeast Asia, and not to the Indian subcontinent. The Association of Indians in America successfully petitioned the U. S. Census Bureau to adopt the term "Asian Indians" for the 1980 census, and this is the term which I shall use in this paper. Unfortunately, this term does not include individuals from other countries of South Asia, such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka. However, there are relatively few immigrants from those countries at present. Eventually, of course, we shall have to coin a new term which will include immigrants from those countries.
3. Kampuchea is the name preferred by the present regime in Cambodia.
4. Until railroad fares were reduced in the 1880's, it cost twice as much to travel by rail from the eastern seaboard to California as by boat (on steerage) from China to California.
5. These included the Opium War, the Taiping Rebellion, the Panti-Hakka Wars, and the Red Turban Uprisings. Chinn, Thomas W., Lai, Him Mark and Philip P. Choy, A History of the Chinese in California, Chinese Historical Society of America, San Francisco, 1971, pp. 11-12.
6. Chan, Sucheng, "Public Policy, U. S.-China Relations and the Chinese American Experience: An Interpretive Essay," in Clausen, Edwin and Jack Bermingham (eds.), Pluralism, Racism and Public Policy, G. K. Hall and Co., Boston, 1981, pp. 7-8.
7. Studies of Chinese immigration to Latin America include Watt, Stewart, Chinese Bondage in Peru, Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1970; Chang, Ching Chieh, The Chinese in Latin America, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1956; and Corbitt, D. C., A Study of the Chinese in Cuba, 1847-1947, Ashbury College, Wilmurs, Ky., 1971.
8. Bancroft, Hubert H., California Pastoral, 1768-1848, The History Company, San Francisco, 1888; and Cleland, Robert G., The Cattle on a

Thousand Hills: Southern California, 1850-1880, The Huntington Library, San Marino, 1951.

9. Nash, Gerald D., "Stages of California's Economic Growth, 1870-1970," California Historical Quarterly, LI (Winter, 1972), pp. 315-30.

10. Higgins, F. Hal, "Our Centennials and Agriculture," California Magazine of the Pacific, XXXVII (June 1947), pp. 16-17; Higgins, F. Hal, "The Cradle of the Combine," Pacific Rural Press, CXXXIII (Feb. 1937), pp.284-85; and Higgins, F. Hal, "83 Years of Equipping California Farms," Pacific Rural Press, CXXXIII (Feb.1937), pp.231-77.

11. Saxton, Alexander, "The Army of Canton in the High Sierra," Pacific Historical Review, 35: 2 (May, 1966).

12. A series of anti-Chinese mob violence broke out in many localities in the western United States in the middle of the 1880's and the early 1890's. In California, mobs expelled Chinese residents from a total of twenty-seven towns: Anderson, Auburn, Carson, Chico, Dixon, Gold Run, Hollister, Lincoln, Los Angeles, Merced, Napa, Nevada City, Pasadena, Petaluma, Placerville, Redding, Sacramento, San Buenaventura, San Jose, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, Sonoma, Truckee, Vallejo, Wheatland and Yuba City. Sandmeyer, Elmer C., The Anti-Chinese Movement in California, Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Urbana, 1939, p. 97. For the 1885 Rock Springs, Wyoming anti-Chinese massacre, see Sargent, A. A., "The Wyoming Anti-Chinese Riot," Overland Monthly (Nov., 1885), pp. 507-12, and "Memorial of Chinese Laborers Resident at Rock Springs, Wyoming Territory to the Chinese Consul in New York," in Wu, Cheng-tsu (ed.), "Chink!" World Publishing Co., New York, 1971, pp. 152-66. For outbreaks in Seattle, Washington, see Kinnear, George, Anti-Chinese Riots at Seattle, Washington, February 8, 1886, Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Riots, Seattle, 1911; Karlin, Jules A., "The Anti-Chinese Outbreaks in Seattle, 1885-1886," Pacific Historical Quarterly, XXXIX: 2 (April, 1948); and Wilcox, W. P., "Anti-Chinese Riots in Washington," Washington Historical Quarterly, XX: 3 (July 1929), pp. 204-11.

13. Tsuchida, Nobuya, Issei: the First Fifty Years, Asian American Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 1975, pp. 4-6.

14. Gee, Emma, "Issei: the First Women," Asian Women, Berkeley, 1971, pp. 8-15.

15. Modell, John, The Economics and Politics of Racial Accommodation: the Japanese of Los Angeles, 1900-1942, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1977.

16. Studies of Korean immigration and settlement are relatively few in number. Among the more recent ones are Kim, Hyung-chan (ed.), The Korean Diaspora, ABC-CLIO, Inc., Santa Barbara, 1977; Choy, B. Y., Koreans in America, Nelson-Hall, Inc., Chicago, 1979, and Melendy, H. Brett, Asians in

America: Filipinos, Koreans and East Indians, Twayne Publishers, Boston, 1977, pp. 111-72.

17. Studies of Asian Indian immigration and settlement are also relatively few in number. The most complete general survey is Melendy, op. cit., pp. 175-248.

18. The standard reference on pre-World War II Filipino immigration is Lasker, Bruno, Filipino Immigration, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931, reprinted by The Arno Press, 1969. Quinsaat, Jesse (ed.), Letters in Exile, Asian American Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976, contains a number of articles which treat specific aspects of the Filipino American experience in greater depth. See also Melendy, op. cit., pp. 17-108, and Munoz, Alfredo N., The Filipinos in America, Mountainview Publishers, Los Angeles, 1972.

19. Riggs, Fred, Pressures on Congress: A Study of the Repeal of Chinese Exclusion, King's Crown Press, New York, 1950.

20. Melendy, op. cit., p. 50, and p. 206.

21. McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, 1952, U. S. Statutes, LXVI, 175, 177 and 239.

22. Melendy, op. cit., p. 207.

23. Chinn, Lai and Choy, op. cit., pp. 28-30.

24. Kim, Bok Lim, Women in Shadows, National Committee Concerned with Asian Wives of U. S. Servicemen, La Jolla, Ca., 1982.

25. Clausen, Edwin, "Pluralism or Class: 'Success' and Former American-Educated Students in the United States," in Clausen, Edwin and Jack Bermingham (eds.), op. cit., pp. 33-69.

26. The power of the merchants was institutionalized by their control of the various community organizations to which a large proportion of the immigrants belonged. In Chinese American communities, family associations and district associations were the most important; in Japanese American communities, prefectural associations were the most important.

27. Kim, Warren Y., Koreans in America, Po Chin Chai Printing Co., Seoul, Korea, 1951, pp. 73-90, 118-155; Juergensmeyer, Mark, "The Ghadar Syndrome: Immigrant Sikhs and Nationalist Pride," in Juergensmeyer, Mark and Gerald N. Barrier (eds.), Sikh Studies: Comparative Perspectives on a Changing Tradition, The Berkeley Religious Studies Series, Berkeley, 1979, pp. 173-90; and Lawcock, Larry A., Filipino Students in the United States and the Philippine Independence Movement: 1900-1935, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University

of California, Berkeley, 1975.

28. Miller, Stuart C., The Unwelcome Immigrants: The American Images of the Chinese, 1785-1882, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969.

29. Lai, Him Mark and Philip P. Choy, Outlines History of the Chinese in America, Chinese American Studies Planning Group, San Francisco, 1973, p.85.

30. McGovney, Dudley O., "The Anti-Japanese Land Laws of California and Ten Other States," California Law Review, 35 (1947), pp. 7-34.

31. Konvits, Milton R., The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1946.

32. The precedent for denying the right of naturalization to Asian immigrants was set in 1878 when the petition of Ah Yup, a Chinese immigrant, to be naturalized was denied by the San Francisco Circuit Court. The 1881 Chinese Exclusion Law reaffirmed the denial of the right of naturalization to Chinese immigrants. In 1922, in the Ozawa case, the U. S. Supreme Court also denied the right of naturalization to a Japanese immigrant. In 1923, in the Thind case, the U. S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of denying the right of naturalization to an Asian Indian immigrant, even though the court recognized that Asian Indians are of the caucasian race.

33. Da Galla, Paul M., "Lantern in the Western Sky," Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly, XLII: 1 and 2 (March and June, 1960), pp. 57-88 and 161-85 respectively; and Jensen, Joan M., "Federal Policy in the Shaping of Indian Occupations in the United States," paper delivered at the Western Conference of Asian Studies, 1974.

34. Bogardus, Emory S., "Anti-Filipino Race Riots: A Report Made to the Ingram Institute of Social Science of San Diego," Ingram Institute, San Diego, 1930, reprinted in Quinsaat, op. cit., pp. 51-62.

35. Heizer, Robert F. and Alan J. Almquist, The Other Californians, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971, p. 175.

36. Wollenberg, Charles M., All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools, 1855-1975, University of California Press, 1976.

37. Weglyn, Michi, Years of Infamy: the Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps, William Morrow and Co., New York, 1976.

38. The image of Asian Americans as the "successful minority" was first popularized in a Newsweek article in 1966.

39. The most systematic attempt by Asian Pacific Americans to influence policy making on educational issues at the federal level is contained in

Asian/Pacific American Education Agenda for the 1980's, a series of resolutions prepared under the coordination of Office of the Asian/Pacific American Concerns Staff in the U. S. Department of Education.

40. Some of the basic arguments in favor of bilingual education are contained in the brief for the Lau v. Nichols case. For an analysis of how the case came to be presented, see Wang, Ling-chi, "Lau v. Nichols: the Right of Limited-English-speaking Students," Amerasia Journal, 2: 2 (fall, 1974), pp. 16-45.

41. Chan, Sucheng, "Contemporary Asian Immigration and Its Impact on Undergraduate Education at the University of California, Berkeley," Center for Studies in Higher Education Occasional Paper Number 17, Center for Studies in Higher Education, Berkeley, 1981.

42. Cabezas, Amado Y., "A View of Poor Linkages between Education, Occupation and Earnings for Asian Americans," paper presented at The Third National Forum on Education and Work, San Francisco, 1977, Asian Inc., San Francisco, 1977, p. 14.

43. Ibid., pp. 16-19.

44. Cabezas, Amado Y., "Disadvantaged Employment Status of Asian and Pacific Americans," Civil Rights Issues of Asian and Pacific Americans: Myths and Realities, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., 1979, pp. 434-44. See also Wu, Yuan-li, et al., Economic Conditions of Asian Americans, Asian American Mental Health Research Center Occasional Paper Number 3, Asian Science Research Associates, Menlo Park, Ca., 1976.

45. The Hmong tribesmen were one of the main groups of Laotians to be evacuated in 1975 after the changes in government in the three countries of Indochina, because many of them had been employed by the Central Intelligence Agency and by the U. S. Army during the American war in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Most of these tribespeople had little exposure to even the rudimentary elements of modern life.

46. Pacific/Asian Elderly Research Project, Understanding the Pacific/Asian Elderly: Critical Factors in Service Delivery, Pacific/Asian Elderly Research Project, Los Angeles, 1978.

47. The most comprehensive study of the "quality of life" in an Asian American community is the Chinatown Environment and Quality of Life Survey conducted by Chalsa Loo and associates in the [San Francisco] Chinatown Housing and Health Research Project, 1978.